Reed No. 4800-0002

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE d to a collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of information unless it displays a volid OMB according to the collection of th Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person

**TRANSMITTAL FORM** 

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Mail Stop Amendment

٤	are required to respond to a collection	of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.
	Application Number	10/611,673
	Filing Date	June 30, 2003
	First Named Inventor	Phillip J. Brock
	Art Unit	2652
	Examiner Name	Tianjie Chen
	Attorney Docket Number	HS 10-2003-002311S1

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)					
No fee due   Fee Transmittal   Fee(s) due   Fee Transmittal   Check for \$*   Charge any underpayment of the credit any overpayment of the peposit Account No. 50-20   Return postcard   Response to Requirement   Affidavits/declaration(state)   Extension of Time Request   Express Abandonment Recurrence   Information Disclosure State   Express Abandonment Recurrence   Copy(ies) of cited   reference(s)   Certified Copy of Priority   Document(s)   Response to Missing Parts   Incomplete Application   Response to Missing Respo	Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation, Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s):  Remarks: The Commissioner is hereby authorized underpayment of fee(s) to Deposit Accorded	□ Drawing(s)       □ After Allowance Communication to a Technology Center (TC)         □ Petition       □ Appeal Communication to Boo of Appeals and Interferences         □ Provisional Application       □ Appeal Communication to TO (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)         □ Power of Attorney, Revocation, Change of Correspondence Address       □ Proprietary Information         □ Status Letter       □ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):         □ CD, Number of CD(s):			
	SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR A	GENT			
Firm or Individual Name (print/type)	Harry G. Thibault, Reg. No.26,347 Reed Intellectual Property Law Group	Telephone	(650) 330-0900		
Signature	Harry G. Thibault	Date	January 6, 2005		
	, , , , , , ,				
	CERT/FICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING				
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.					
Name (print/type) Jôe Çlark/ / /					
Signature		Date	January 6, 2005		
F:\Document\4800\0002\Restriction Requirement Response Transmittal.doc					

Application No. 10/611,673 P Response dated January 6, 2005

Residence to Restriction Requirement dated December 7, 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RADELLA Re Application of:

Phillip J. BROCK et al.

Confirmation No.: 5373

Serial No.: 10/611,673

Group Art Unit: 2652

Filing Date: June 30, 2003

Examiner: Tianjie CHEN

JAN 1 0 2005

Title: SLIDERS BONDED BY A DEBONDABLE ENCAPSULANT CONTAINING

STYRENE AND BUTADIENE POLYMERS

## RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Requirement for Restriction mailed December 7, 2004, in which the Examiner required restriction between two groups of claims:

- (I.) Claims 1-20, drawn to a slider; and
- (II.)Claims 21-30, drawn to a method of making a slider.

The Examiner's position is that inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. He goes on to say that the inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f). He then concludes that the invention of Group I is distinct from the invention of Group II because the slider disclosed in group I can be made without the particular step of "the solvent represents 30wt% to about 5wt% of the encapsulation fluid as dispensed" as recited in Group II.

Applicant argues the particular claim limitation of Group II as recited above first appears in dependent claim 25. Claim 1 recites "a slider by a debondable solid encapsulent, wherein the encapsulent is comprised of styrene and butadiene polymers,..." and independent method claim 20 recites "(b) dispensing an encapsulation fluid comprised of styrene and butadiene polymers in a manner effective to bind or encapsulate the sliders...". The similarity of these recitations fail

Application No. 10/611,673
Response dated January 6, 2005
Response to Restriction Requirement dated December 7, 2004

to make it clear (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product can be made by another and materially different process.

Moreover, it would appear that the Examiner would encounter no particular hardship if required to search the Group I and Group II claims together.

Thus, in response, applicant elects Group 1, claims 1-20, with traverse. Applicant expressly reserves its right under 35 USC § 121 to file a divisional application directed to the nonelected subject matter during the pendency of this application.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this communication, or would like to discuss the application, the art, or other pertinent matters, he is welcome to contact the undersigned attorney at (650) 330-0900.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Harry G. Thibauk

Registration No. 26,347

Reed Intellectual Property Law Group 800 Menlo Avenue, Suite 210 Menlo Park, California 94025 (650) 330-0900 Telephone (650) 330-0980 Facsimile F:\Document\4800\00002\Restriction Requirement Response.DOC